

Application Number 10/785,513
Responsive to Office Action mailed April 25, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

REMARKS

JUN 25 2007

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 15-16 and 20-35 are pending in the application.

In this response, claim 1 is amended to specify that the filter(s) are disposed between the at least two discs of the system. The amendment is supported in the specification, for example, in Fig. 4 and in independent claims 15 and 20. Since the proposed amendment does not present new issues and would not require additional consideration or search, entry into the record is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request further examination of the application and reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated April 25, 2007.

I. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, 7, 24-29 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rannow (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0021527; hereafter referred to as Rannow). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the extent such rejection may be considered applicable to the amended claims. Rannow fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and provides no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to include such features.

For example, Rannow fails to teach or suggest a data storage system with at least two disc drives and having a filter between the at least two disc drives as recited by Applicant's claim 1 as amended.

The Rannow reference describes a number of embodiments of disc drive filtration systems with an arcuate cap filter extending along a top surface of a disc, an elongate perimeter filter along the outer perimeter of a disc, or a combination thereof.¹ In the embodiments with multiple disc packs, Rannow teaches that the elongate perimeter filter may be used, but fails to teach or suggest that the flat and arcuate cap filters may be disposed between the discs.² In addition, Rannow teaches that the cap filter may be attached to the top cover of the disc drive

¹ Rannow, paragraphs 34-35.

² *Id.*, at paragraph 36.

Application Number 10/785,513
Responsive to Office Action mailed April 25, 2007

system as required by claim 1, and as such further fails to teach or suggest how such a filter could be attached to the disc drive housing to allow filtration of air flow between the discs.³

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 6-8, 24-29, 30-31, and 34-35 are neither anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) nor *prima facie* obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rannow. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Rannow as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view that official notice is taken of the many types of filtering materials which are commercially available and adaptable to filter requirements in disk drives.

As noted in Section I above, Rannow fails to teach or suggest placement of a filter between at least two of the discs. The official notice cited by the Examiner does not overcome this deficiency, and for this reason Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8, which depends from claim 1, is not *prima facie* obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rannow.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 15-16, 20-23 and 32-33 are allowable over the art of record.

Paragraph 6 further states that claims 30-31 and 35 are objected to as dependent on a rejected base claim (claim 1), but include allowable subject matter.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for these indications of allowability.

CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims.

³ Rannow, paragraph 32.

-7-

Application Number 10/785,513
Responsive to Office Action mailed April 25, 2007

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778.

If questions remain regarding the above, or if the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of the above application, please contact the undersigned.

Date:

By:

June 25, 2007
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300
Woodbury, Minnesota 55125
Telephone: 651.735.1100
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

Name: H. Sanders Gwin, Jr.
Reg. No.: 33,242

-8-

BEST AVAILABLE COPY